

From: Bill Keough
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/28/02 3:28pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The recent history of antitrust has been a jihad by the Department of Justice against a pantheon of American industry. Antitrust cases against IBM, Intel and Microsoft seemed to have been designed to wreck the high tech industry. Al-Qaida could not have designed a more devious program to destroy the U.S. economy. Hyperbole? The current recession was started or at least given a boost by the stepped up legal action against Microsoft and the consequent fall of it's stock. Hundreds of billions of dollars have been lost.

This suit has unleashed a mob of whining moochers angling for a chunk of cash or control of Microsoft. If this lawsuit is upheld it will result in the virtual destruction of the company, maybe not at once, but surely in a drawn out death by fragmentation and bankruptcy. No more operating systems, no more Web browsers, no more games, no more office software, no more jobs, no more nothing.

Contrast the way Microsoft does business with the way the Post Office, a real monopoly, does business. Can Microsoft prevent the entry of competitors into its realm of business? No it can't, but the Post Office routinely does this the only way possible: by the use of force or the threat of force. There is no other way to bar competition than to resort to force. Entry in a field of business however does not ensure success. Your competitors do not have to make allowances for your weaknesses by tailoring their business practices so you can survive. Everything is permitted except force or fraud.

As Bill Gates has said many times, no one has been forced to do business with them. If their partners do not like the terms Microsoft sets they are always free to leave. Microsoft should not be compelled to open up its products to competitors. Windows and Internet Explorer are their property to dispose of as they see fit.

This is the essence of the case, or lack of a case, against Microsoft. Envious competitors complain about Microsoft's business practices, which they themselves routinely use.

On a personal level, I started with the Prodigy browser and then switched to AOL. Finally when I bought a new computer I ended up with Internet Explorer. I never had any trouble switching browsers and from a business point of view it would not make sense to impede the installation of new software. After all what would be the point of an operating system that sabotaged certain programs? That Microsoft includes an internet browser with windows does not mean you have to use it. Competing browsers on CDs are so numerous they are regarded as junk mail.

The Department of Justice case against Microsoft is not just senseless but in a recession and a time of war it is doubly destructive. Reason and justice dictate that this case should be dismissed.

William B. Keough
Seattle, Washington